DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 354 592 EA 024 617

AUTHOR Desmarais, Julie
TITLE Teachers' Opinions of the Characteristics of Good Inservice Programs as Suggested in Current Research.
PUB DATE [92]
NOTE 17p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Change; Elementary Education; *Elementary School Teachers; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS *La Grange School District 105 IL

ABSTRACT

Inservice teacher education suffers many shortcomings, including a tradition of being reactive rather than proactive. Historically, inservice education was used to make up for educators' poor teaching skills when they entered the field. School systems also relied on new teachers to introduce innovative ideas on educational change. Today, inservice education is designed to keep teachers up to date about changes in education and society. However, inservice education still suffers many shortcomings. Research shows there is little continuity in inservice education, and specific objectives are not clearly outlined. Also, inservice programs are too short and contain little or no followup. Several keys to designing effective inservice programs include collaboration in planning staff development; administrator, teacher, and parent participation; long-range planning and goals; professional needs and concerns orientation; specific and concrete discussion, practice, and support; school-based and school-focused approach; and use of theory, modeling, practice, feedback, and coaching. Sixty-three teachers surveyed in School District 105, LaGrange, Illinois, said they were dissatisfied with inservice education programs they now participate in and named the above elements among needed improvements. (Contains 15 references.) (JPT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED354592

TEACHERS' OPINIONS OF THE CHARACTERISTICS OF GOOD INSERVICE PROGRAMS AS SUGGESTED IN CURRENT RESEARCH

Julie Desmarais

Taking an historical look into the inservice education that has been provided for educators over the years, the realization that inservice has been reactive rather than proactive is readily seen (Harris, 1980). In the beginning, the overwhelming need for teachers caused individuals to be hired with the knowledge that additional training was not only necessary but imperative. inservice education at that time was an attempt to compensate for the lack of preservice training. Teachers were placed in the classroom with an eighth grade or high school diploma. As people began to congregate in cities, the demands made upon teachers changed drastically. There was a need for more knowledgeable teachers. Teachers were provided with more comprehensive preservice training concerning the ideology and methodology of teaching, and became increasingly more effective and accomplished in their field.

While preservice education for teachers was improving, there still remained a shortage of teachers entering the field. This state of affairs continued for a long time because well-trained staff members were constantly being loss to industry and family rearing, and the situation is only worsening today due to the growing opportunities for women in other occupations. The 1990's will once again show a teacher shortage due to the increase of students in the public schools while the enrollments in colleges of education remain at low levels. At present, however, inservice has evolved away from the need to compensate for the lack of preservice education and has become more a matter of continuing education in order to cope with the constant changes in the world of today.

Social and economic developments such as desegregation, divorce, suburbanization, and the effect of drugs on students have continued to force inservice education into the reactive rather than proactive approach. Administrators have recognized that inservice education needs to address the constant and ever-changing demands of the curriculum and methodology, the additional job-related pressures in our society today, and the increasing challenges created by the ever present changes in demographic conditions (Elam and others, 1986). Educators need to be responsive to the needs and these demands of society, and school administrators, local boards, supervisors, and state legislatures have shown an interest in providing for effective inservice education to assist teachers in dealing with these demands (Harris, 1980).

SP 024 617

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. Desmarais
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Though inservice education has had a long history and is recognized as an essential part of the on-going operation of the school, it is always being pushed towards the back burner by other seemingly more important issues in education such as "school reform" or "excellence" (Harris, 1989). There are growing convictions within the field of education that recognize the fact that improvements in the schools will only result from improving the people operating the schools. Consequently, inservice education "may be unique as a developmental task in our schools more by virtue of being widely neglected than because of its obvious importance" (Harris, 1980, p. 29). Approaches to inservice education need to become more proactive. Educators need to develop ways in which to systematically deal with the constant change that is occurring within the world today. Hirsh and Ponder (1991) state that recent staff development research has defined systematic processes for ensuring positive and successful change. Educators can no longer sit back and react to all the technological, social, and educational revelations and innovations that are occurring; they need to take a more proactive stance in order to meet these changes head on.

In conclusion, Brimm and Tollett (1974) summed up the meaning of present day inservice education when they stated that:

> The professional preparation of teachers is a continuing process, and self-renewal must occur if teachers are to stay in tune with the changing needs of their students. Effective inservice programs should help the teacher meet these changing needs (p. 521-522).

Inservice education can be referred to and defined in many ways. Other words used synonymously for inservice education are staff development, professional growth, continuing education, and on-the-job-training. Though these terms are at times used interchangeably, the connotative and denotative meanings behind the different terms are distinct. So for the purposes of this paper, the term inservice education will be used.

In reviewing the literature, there are many different ways in which to define inservice education. A National Institute of Education (NIE) study states that inservice education is:

> Any school district activity that is intended partly or primarily to prepare paid staff members for improved performance in present or possible future roles in the school district (Elam and others, 1986, p. 5).

While Harris (1989) uses the term inservice education to mean "any planned program of learning opportunities afforded staff members of schools, colleges, or other educational agencies for purposes of

improving the performance of the individual in already assigned positions" (p. 18).

According to Thomas Gusky (1986), inservice education programs "are a systematic attempt to bring about change - change in the classroom practices of teachers, change in their beliefs and attitudes, and change in the learning outcomes of students" (p.5).

The definitions found throughout the available literature do have common elements. For the purposes of this paper, inservice education will be defined simply as any program or activity designed to have a positive influence upon the teaching and learning that is occurring within the school.

When the issues around inservice education are explored, it can be seen that though this area is seen as important to the impact of education, that few changes have occurred in this field over the years. For the most part, inservice programs continue to be "one shot deals" where knowledgeable speakers are brought in to share insights and inspire teachers (Koehler, 1991). Little has been done within the context of inservice education to bring about a positive systematic change. In the past fifteen years, however, a great deal of research has gone into defining what characteristics make up effective inservice education programs. Though some of the characteristics differ from study to study, there is a core body of characteristics that is being identified over and over again in study after study. What are those characteristics, and are they being implemented? What do teachers think about these characteristics? Do teachers agree with the researchers on what characteristics make up an effective inservice education program? Answers to these questions will be the focus of this paper.

According to Baden (1979), "the professional development of teachers through locally developed inservice education activities is becoming an increasingly common activity in school districts" (p.2). He goes on to give several reasons why this increase in activity is occurring. Previously, new ideas and innovations came into the school with the annual hiring of a large percent of new teachers, or from teachers within the system taking graduate level courses while pursuing their masters degree. Today, staff turnover rates are much lower, and the teachers working in the schools have already received their terminal degrees. Consequently, the influx of new ideas is not coming into the school through the traditional avenues. So the most common form of changing teacher behavior and knowledge in today's reality has to come from inservice education activities.

Though Baden (1979) sites an increase in activity in the area of inservice education, it has not "created an immediate improvement in the quality of inservice education" (p.2). He goes on to list some

characteristics that demonstrate the lack of change in the approach or development of inservice education. Programs are still planned in a disjointed fashion with little or no continuity from one program to the next, programs are still planned by administrators with little or no input from all potential participants, activities are still planned without setting specific objectives and consequently only shallow discussion of current topics occurs, too little time is being allotted for a thorough examination of a topic, little or no follow-up is provided, and finally, participants in the program remain unchanged. In Goldenberg and Gallimore's (1991) article, evidence is cited that there has been no fundamental change in the way American teachers teach in more than a century, and that student achievement is unchanged within the last twenty years. If this is indeed the reality of current inservice education programs and their effects, then current research findings need to be considered.

Edelfelt (1983) compiled a document which consisted of eleven papers dealing with staff development. In one article by Winifred Warnat a program is discussed that is designed to improve staff development through school-university collaboration. It states that this program design has flourished because staffs have been involved in the planning, implementing, and evaluating of their own inservice program. Collaboration between the school and the university is another important characteristic of this program. The development of this program was based on five assumptions:

1.) The school building is the key unit to effect constructive change.
2.) The school staff must be actively involved in determining how change (improvement) will occur.
3.) Ownership of and commitment to the change process by the school staff are essential. They are natural by-products of shared planning and decision making.
4.) Such change contributes to an improved learning climate - improvement of the instructional performance of teachers and the academic performance of student.
5.) Staff development using the six-step process contributes to school improvement.

In Goldenberg and Gallimore's (1991) article, they state that the quick-fix workshop approach of inservice education needs to be abandoned, and instead a program that is grounded in the teachers' work lives and assists and supports meaningful change needs to be implemented.

Koehler (1991) contends that inservice activities in the school have suffered from substantive neglect in most schools. He questions the contents of most programs in regards to professional growth and does not

see the planned follow-up activities needed to assist the teacher in meaningful change. He sees a need to relate inservice to yearly goals and supervisory processes.

Several cautionary statements pertaining to inservice are contained in Hirsh and Ponder's (1991) article. These cautionary statements found throughout the article are:

1.) Schools need substantive plans; administrators and teachers need new understandings and new skills in order to achieve successful restructuring.
2.) Staff developers should be held accountable for the information they share. Consumers should ask for documentation regarding anticipated results.
3.) If you wait for everybody to be ready, you may never begin the change process.
4.) Principals and teachers will not participate voluntarily in meaningless inservice.
5.) Broaden your current definition of staff development.
6.) Seek expertise from within before you go searching outside.
7.) Teacher-as-researcher models provide proven ways for teachers to conduct systematic inquiry into classroom problems. The future will see greater collaboration between university professors and school practitioners in research on practice.
8.) Until we give appropriate attention to follow-up, staff development will continue to lack impact.

Purcell (1987) did a comprehensive review of literature concerning the effectiveness and quality of inservice programs. He found the following characteristics to be supported. Staff development programs are more effective when based on long range goals and are incorporated into the classroom. The greater the relevancy of the program to the teachers and their classrooms, the more effective the programs is. Current ideas support the idea that inservice programs should be aimed at changing teacher as well as student behavior. Inservice programs should be the delivery system for new knowledge and skills which are transferable to the daily problems faced by teachers. Teachers need assistance in developing and integrating newly learned concepts and techniques into the classroom through follow-up activities. Finally, active participation and other methods such as coaching and modeling which have proven to be more effective in their approach should be utilized in staff development programs.

Another review of the literature concerning staff development which analyzed the characteristics of effective inservice programs was done by McHaney and Impey (1988). They compiled their findings in a table which

details seven areas of common features of effective programs. These seven features are as follows:

1.) Collaboration in organizing and planning staff development increases commitment which makes a program more successful.
2.) Participation of administrators, teachers, and parents in designing staff development programs will provide for greater success.
3.) Long range planning of inservice programs will increase conformity with school district goals.
4.) Staff development is more effective when based upon the professional needs and concerns of school employees.
5.) Programs that are more specific and concrete in discussion as well as practice and support the translation of ideas into practice are more successful.
6.) School-based/school-focused programs are far more effective than any other type of inservice education.
7.) Effective inservice programs contain training that includes presentation of theory, modeling, practice, feedback, and coaching.

Mark Smylie (1989) of the University of Chicago did an analyses of data from a national survey of teachers concerning their views of the effectiveness of different sources of learning. He found that out of the fourteen sources involved in the survey, that inservice training provided by school districts ranked among the least effective practices. In fact, inservice education ranked consistently thirteenth or fourteenth in the teachers' opinions of effectiveness. In summarizing the results, the article states that although inservice education is strongly emphasized and relatively well supported, that it plays a small and ineffectual role. The traditional forms which provide one-shot programs at the beginning or end of the year with no follow-up have been shown in the research to be ineffective and teachers agree.

Rappa (1983) studied effective practices found in staff inservice programs in Massachusetts, conducted by TDR Associates under a cooperative agreement with the Commonwealth Inservice Institute of the Massachusetts Department of Education. He conducted a basic research study, not an evaluation of the programs, and found these results through the conduction of an intensive questionnaire-interview survey approach. Teachers reported the following needs. They want to be successful with students and recognized by their superiors. They need information on new and varied teaching and motivational methods. They prefer to learn through hands-on activities and by putting information into practice in their classrooms. Instructional methods that were seen as more effective by teachers were using small group discussion, providing for practice and implementation of skills learned, and observing other participants in practice. Procedures that had a

negative effect as seen by teachers were lectures and information packages which presented the workshops content. In regards to organizational characteristics, the following characteristics were given positive ratings by teachers. The optimal time involvement was between 12 and 32 hours, and one-day workshops have minimal impact. The optimal size of a group was between 8 and 20. Single school workshops were seen as having a more positive impact than multi-school workshops. Particularly successful inservice workshops were those that allowed teachers to try out and report on their new experiences and skills, those that supplied teachers with resources and information that was easily adaptable to the classroom, and those that required teachers to develop projects or activities for their own classes.

Brimm and Tollett (1974) conducted a statewide research study in Tennessee that yielded information concerning the teachers opinions of inservice education. They received 646 usable questionnaires which constituted about 65% of the sample. The item that received the strongest endorsement by the teachers was concerned with the teachers ability to have some involvement in the selection of the kind of inservice activities which they feel will strengthen their professional competence. Teachers also were seen as preferring to have inservice programs conducted within their own school setting. Teachers strongly agreed that one of the primary purposes of inservice should be to help the teacher become more effective in the classroom. Unfortunately, many teachers in the survey felt that inservice activities were not relevant to the needs of the teacher. A great deal of teachers thought that their inservice programs were not well-planned, and that they did not specify what objectives were being addressed. More than half of the teachers agreed with the statement that, "Most teachers do not like to attend inservice activities."

A summary of this research and information needs to be done in order to pull together the common elements of the findings. The next four paragraphs will attempt to consolidate the information presented in this review.

School improvement is one of the issues of primary concern found in public schools today. It is stated that school improvement can result only from the improvement of the people working within the schools (Hirsh and Ponder, 1991). It is the people within the schools that are best able to identify their needs and design a program that will be able to meet those needs. As stated above, many research studies have established the fact that when a school staff takes part in the planning, implementing, and evaluating of their own inservice education programs, the programs flourish and change is more likely to occur (Edelfelt, 1983; Hirsh and Ponder, 1991; McHaney and Impey, 1988).

The role of inservice education in the school needs to be addressed. Research suggests that inservice education programs should be designed to instigate behavior and programmatic changes that improve the quality of instruction within the school (Baden, 1979; McHaney and Impey, 1988). In order for change to occur, teachers need more than just information given to them by speakers. Teachers need to be provided with realistic training and follow-up activities in order to be able to fully integrate new knowledge and techniques into their classrooms (Hirsh and Ponder, 1991; Purcell, 1987; Koehler, 1991; Gurskey and Sparks, 1991; Goldenberg and Gallimore, 1991).

Inservice education must begin to address the problems teachers face in their daily work lives. When inservice provides the opportunity to learn information or techniques that have the potential to improve job performance, this is a powerful motivator to the staff (Dillon, 1978). Also, the research shows that the more relevant an activity is to the work setting, the more likely the program will be effective (Brimm and Tollett, 1974; Purcell, 1987; Mc Haney and Impey, 1988).

Finally, research suggests that not only is it better to focus on problems that teachers face in their daily work lives, but also to focus on having inservice education programs that are school-based and school-focused (McHaney and Impey, 1988; Purcell, 1987). Incorporation of long range goals into the inservice program that correlate with and are integrated into district goals provides for a more soundly based program. Teachers are more likely to invest themselves in this type of program because it is seen as being more functional and related to what they are doing within their classrooms.

A great deal of teachers time and tax payers money is spent on inservice programs within the schools. In order for schools to make proper decisions concerning the development and quality of these programs, the research on the topic needs to be comprehensive and accurate. There is a great deal of literature and research today that states what characteristics go into creating an effective inservice program within the school. While on the other hand, there is a shortage of research that states teachers opinions of these characteristics. Teachers are the people who are directly involved in the inservice programs, so it is imperative to know what they think of the research findings. Teachers opinions need to be represented in the research. If it is found that teachers and researchers are in agreement concerning the characteristics that go into developing a good inservice program, then more pressure can be brought to bear within the field of education to call for a restructuring of current inservice programs in order to reflect these commonly agreed on characteristics. Consequently, this will lead to better utilization of the teachers time and tax payers money.

Therefore, the purpose of this study is to determine what are teachers opinions of the characteristics found in good inservice programs as suggested in current research?

Procedures

Brimm and Tollett's (1974) questionnaire entitled "Teacher Attitudes Toward In-service Inventory" was revised to measure teachers' attitudes towards the characteristics found in good inservice programs as suggested in current research on the subject. The revised questionnaire was entitled "Teachers Attitudes Towards Current Inservice Trends".

The questionnaire was given to all the teachers in School District #105 in the LaGrange area which is one of the western suburbs of Chicago. The district consists of four elementary schools and one junior high school with a population of around one thousand students. There are a total of seventy-six teachers in the district (nineteen at the junior high level and fifty-seven at the elementary level). Caucasian teachers make up the overwhelming majority of the teaching staff (98.7%), and female teachers outnumber male teachers by more than two to one. Almost three-fourths of the teaching staff have received their master's degrees, and the average teaching experience is 14.6 years.

This study includes the available sample of seventy-six classroom and/or specialists teachers. Sixty-three usable returns were received from the teachers, which represents eighty-three percent of the population sample. Teachers from each of the schools were included.

The results of the questionnaire were then tabulated, the percentages of agree, disagree, and uncertain were analyzed to determine the attitudes of the teachers towards the current trends of inservice programs. The Chi Square was used to determine the statistical significance (.05) of the responses.

Findings

The data in the table show that the majority of the teachers agree with the current trends and ideas found in the research concerning inservice education programs for educators. In the section of the questionnaire that dealt with the organization and planning of inservice programs there were two questions that received 100% agreement. They stated that inservice programs should arise from a study of the needs and problems of teachers and be well-planned. A significant number of teachers agree that teachers should be involved in the planning, selection, and method of evaluation of inservice programs instead of administrators or others outside of the school district. Forty-nine percent of the teachers disagreed with the statement that inservice programs should be developed

TABLE I

RESPONSES TO INSERVICE QUESTIONNAIRE

A. AGREE B. DISAGREE C. UNCERTAIN

N = 63

A	B	C	
17	31	15	1.) Inservice programs should be developed as one-shot,
27%	49%*	24%	informational, or inspirational activities.
62	1	0	2.) Teachers should be involved in planning inservice
98%*	2%	0%	programs.
62	0	1	3.) The format of inservice programs should allow for
98%*	0%	2%	teachers' input and evaluation.
4	55	4	4.) Administrators or others outside of the school
6%	88%*	6%	district should organize most of the inservice programs.
11	43	9	5.) Administrators should play dominant roles in planning
18%	68%*	14%	and organizing inservice meetings.
63	0	0	6.) Inservice programs should arise from a study of the
100%*	0%	0%	needs and problems of the teachers.
63	0	0	7.) Inservice programs should be well-planned.
100%*	0%	0%	
61	2	0	8.) Teachers need to be involved in the developing of
97%*	3%	0%	purposes, activities, and methods of evaluation for inservice programs.
62	0	1	9.) Teachers need to have the opportunity to participate
98%*	0%	2%	in the selection of inservice activities which they feel will strengthen their professional competence.
59	1	3	10.) Objectives of inservice programs should be clearly
94%*	2%	4%	defined.
54	2	7	11.) The objectives of inservice programs should be
86%*	3%	11%	relevant to the school or district goals.
47	7	9	12.) Inservice programs should demonstrate long range
75%*	11%	14%	planning and interrelatedness of its goals.
58	1	4	13.) Inservice activities should be based upon an
92%*	2%	6%	assessment of teachers' needs and concerns.
53	4	6	14.) Inservice activities should be designed to improve
84%*	6%	10%	the instructional program and based upon school goals.
57	2	4	15.) Inservice activities should take into consideration
91%*	3%	6%	the reality of different teacher roles and role-relationships within the school system when addressing school goals.
54	2	7	16.) Inservice programs should have a balanced agenda of
86%*	3%	11%	goals in which individual goals are accomodated within and outside the context of broader institutional goals whether at the state, local, or school level.
34	13	16	17.) Inservice programs should relate directly to problems
54%*	21%	25%	encountered in the classroom .
32	16	15	18.) The primary purpose of inservice programs should be

51%*	25%	24%	to upgrade the teachers classroom performance.
59	2	2	19.) Inservice programs should help teachers to cope
94%*	3%	3%	successfully with professional tasks.
6	41	16	20.) Most teachers like to attend inservice programs.
10%	65%*	25%	
61	0	2	21.) Inservice programs should include activities which
97%*	0%	3%	allow for the different concerns and needs which exist among teachers.
35	16	12	22.) Attendence at township-wide inservice programs should
56%*	25%	19%	be required.
21	26	16	23.) Most inservice programs should be carried on within
33%	42%	25%	the particular school in which the teacher works.
45	8	10	24.) More small group activities that relate directly to
71%*	13%	16%	practices that can be utilized within the classroom should be developed for inservice programs.
50	4	9	25.) More follow-up sessions on a given topic of inservice
80%*	6%	14%	should be provided in order to support integration of inservice information into the classroom.
55	2	6	26.) There should be adequate follow-up evaluation to
87%*	3%	10%	determine the effects of inservice education activities within the school.
55	2	6	27.) The ability to transfer concepts and skills taught
87%*	3%	10%	within inservice programs to the classroom is important.
58	1	4	28.) Inservice meetings should incorporate, into their
92%*	2%	6%	design, opportunities to become knowledgable and competent in the use of new teaching practices and innovative programs.
16	31	16	29.) Inservice training is more effective when the total
25%	50%*	25%	school staff is simultaneously engaged in a given activity.
39	5	19	30.) Techniques which include modeling, practice,
62%*	8%	30%	feedback, and coaching are effective when utilized for inservice programs.
56	3	4	31.) Inservice programs should employ a variety of
89%*	5%	6%	strategies and forms of development beyond the workshop and lecture-discussion format.

* Significance at the .05 level.

as one-shot, informational, or inspirational activities, and this also reflects what is found in the current research on this topic. Research suggests that inservice programs should move away from this one-shot approach. As stated before, teachers need to be provided with realistic training and follow-up activities in order to be able to fully integrate new knowledge and techniques gained through inservice into their classrooms.

In the section concerning the interrelatedness of inservice programs to school or district goals, teachers overwhelmingly agreed with all seven of the questions. They agree that inservice programs should be relevant to school or district goals, be clearly defined, demonstrate long range planning, be based upon the assessment of teachers' needs and concerns, be designed to improve the instructional program, and take into consideration the reality of different teacher roles and individual goals.

Seven questions were asked that dealt with the addressing of professional needs and concerns within a school-based program of inservice. Teachers agree that inservice programs should relate directly to problems encountered in the classroom, and that the program should include activities which allow for the different concerns and needs which exist among teachers. When asked if teachers like to attend inservice programs, sixty-five percent responded negatively. This expresses a general feeling among the teachers that inservice programs are not beneficial. If teachers viewed them as functional, relevant, and useful experiences, then they would respond favorably when asked if they liked to attend. One question's responses within this group did not agree with what is found in the current research. Research suggests that inservice programs are better when conducted within the school in small groups. When asked if attendance at township-wide inservice programs should be required, teachers responded in agreement. The question may have been answered differently if it read, "Township-wide inservice programs are better than school- based programs."

The final section of the questionnaire was concerned with the concreteness and transfer of inservice ideas into practices. The teachers agree that small group activities that relate directly to practices that can be utilized within the classroom, that follow-up sessions are important to support integration of information into the classroom, that follow-up evaluation to determine the effectiveness of inservice training is important, that new teaching practices and transfer of those concepts is important, and that a variety of types of inservice formats be utilized. Teachers disagreed with the idea that inservice training is more effective when the total staff is simultaneously engaged in a given activity. This goes along with the research that suggests that inservice programs should take into

consideration the individual needs of the various teachers within a total program that focuses on school-based goals.

In response to the open ended question at the end of the questionnaire, many teachers made comments that further indicated their agreement with what is found in the current research. The following are those comments:

1.) I have found most inservice days largely a waste of time. I get much more out of attending professional meetings run by organizations to which I belong.

2.) Thank you for asking a humble teacher's opinion. I have been subjected to 18 years of inservice programs; nine out of ten of them are non-applicable to my work. The "inspirational" speakers are often insipid or insulting. We need "tools" that work in our classrooms; and we know what we need. I am so grateful that a decent study is being conducted to study our needs. Thanks.

3.) The quality of the inservice program depends on the quality of the presentation and the audience's willingness to accept what the presenter has to say.

4.) Probably the best inservice includes choices and is voluntary. Teachers should be heavily involved in the planning.

5.) Too often, institute or inservice activities are a rehash of old ideas, and they are at a level far below the experienced teacher. When specials, regular education teachers, special education teachers, nursing staff, etc. are forced to attend the same program, no one seems to benefit.

6.) Instead of requiring attendance at township-wide inservice programs, teachers should have the option of visiting another school or get together with grade-level teachers to share ideas.

7.) Many inservice programs are a waste of valuable time which could be spent in the classroom keeping up with the task of record keeping, parent communication, and planning.

8.) My own frustration with inservice is the follow-through and support. Many fine, well-organized hours of inservice have gone down the drain because teachers go back into their classrooms and are never given the time or adequate support for turning good ideas into workable, ongoing teaching practices.

9.) Goals and needs of student population should define, in some way, teacher goals, problems, needs, etc. Inservice should address the premise: How can staff best meet student needs?

In summary, teachers agree with the research findings concerning inservice education programs. They agree that teachers should take a more active role in planning and implementing their own inservice programs. They agree that inservice programs should be interrelated with the school or district goals. They agree that professional needs and concerns should be addressed within a school-based program. And they agree that there should be provisions within the programs to

provide for concrete ideas that can be transferred and used within the classroom. Since teachers agree with all the things suggested in the research being done on the topic of inservice programs, pressures need to be placed upon those within the field of education that are responsible for planning and implementing these programs to follow and utilize these findings to make inservice education programs more viable and functional for teachers. Inservice programs need to be restructured to reflect these findings so as to better utilize teachers time and tax payers money.

References

Baden, Donald (1979). A users guide to the evaluation of inservice education. Paper presented at the National Workshop of the NCSIE, Hollywood, CA. (Eric Document Reproduction NO. ED 210 252).

Brimm, J.L. & Tollett, D.J. "How do teachers feel about in-service education?" Educational Administration, (March 1974).

Dillion, E.A. (1978). A school board member's guide to staff development. Washington, DC: National School Boards Association. (Eric Document Reproduction No. 153 324).

Edelfelt, Roy A., Ed. Staff development for school improvement: An illustration. Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanati: National Center on Teaching and Learning. (Eric Document No. 230 534).

Elam, Stanley; Cramer, Jerome & Brodinsky, Ben (1986). Staff developments: problems and solutions. AASA Critical Issues Reports.

Goldenberg, Claude & Gallimore, Ronald. "Changing teaching takes more than a one-shot workshop". Educational Leadership. (November 1991).

Gusky, Thomas R. "Staff Developoment and the Process of Teacher Change". Educational Researcher (May 1986)

Guskey, Thomas & Sparks, Dennis. "What to consider when evaluating staff development". Educational Leadership". (November 1991).

Harris, Ben M. (1980). Improving staff performance through in-service education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Harris, Ben M. (1989). In-service education for staff development. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Hirsh, Stephanie & Ponder, Garald. "New plots, new heroes in staff development". Educational Leadership, (November 1991).

McHaney, Jane & Impey, William (1988). Staff development: a review of the literature on effective programs and recommendations for future program development. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Louisville, KY. (Eric Document Reproduction No. ED 303 429).

Purcell, Larry (1987). Factors affecting the quality of staff development. (Eric Document Reproduction No. ED 285 862)

Rappa, Joseph (1983). Characteristics of successful staff inservice training. Massachusetts State Department of Education, Boston. (Eric Document Reproduction No. ED 243 867)

Smylie, Mark. "Teachers' views of the effectiveness of sources of learning to teach". The Elementary School Journal. (May 1989).